

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed April 22, 2005 and made final has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 2-3, 5-11, 13-17, 19-25, and 27-37 are now pending in this application. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 16, 17, 24, and 25 are newly canceled. Claims 7, 15, 21, and 31 have been amended.

No extension of time is believed to be required for entry of this Amendment. However, if an extension of time and/or additional fees are required for entry of this Amendment, authorization is hereby given to consider this a request for the necessary extension of time and/or to charge the Deposit Account shown on the fee calculation sheet the necessary additional fees to enter this amendment.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of Claims 5-6, 13-14, 19-20, 27-28, and 32-35. Applicants also gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 3, 11, 17, and 25.

To facilitate the response to the Office Action, the objection to Claims 3, 7, 17, and 25 is addressed first.

The objection to Claims 3, 11, 17, and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim is respectfully traversed.

The Office indicated that Claims 3 and 17 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 has been canceled by this amendment, but its base claim was Claim 31. Claim 31 has been amended to correspond to Claim 3 rewritten in allowable form as suggested by the Office *in the Office Action dated November 29, 2004* (i.e., the recitation added to Claim 31 concerning the selection of the first degree polynomial to produce unbiased errors has been removed, as this recitation is not believed to be necessary for patentability). Thus, it is submitted that Claim 31 is allowable as herein amended.

Similarly, Claim 17 has been canceled by this amendment, but its base claim was Claim 15. Claim 15 has been amended to correspond to Claim 17 rewritten in allowable

form as suggested by the Office *in the Office Action dated November 29, 2004* (i.e., the recitation added to Claim 31 concerning the selection of the first degree polynomial to produce unbiased errors has been removed, as this recitation is not believed to be necessary for patentability). Thus, it is submitted that Claim 15 is also allowable as herein amended.

Claim 11 has been canceled as unnecessary. However, Claim 8 now corresponds to Claim 11 as a result of the amendment to Claim 31. It is submitted that Claim 31 is now allowable, and thus Claim 8 is dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 25 has been canceled as unnecessary. However, Claim 22 now corresponds to Claim 25 as a result of the amendment to Claim 15. It is submitted that Claim 25 is now allowable, as thus Claim 22 is dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the objection to Claims 3, 11, 17, and 25 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2, 7, 15-16, 21, 29-31, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Larson (U.S. 5,365,465) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 2 and 16, which have been canceled.

As indicated above, Claim 31 has been amended to correspond to Claim 3 rewritten in a form deemed by the Office as being allowable over the art of record. Claim 15 has also been amended to correspond to Claim 17 rewritten in a form deemed by the Office as being allowable over the art of record. Thus, this rejection no longer applies to Claims 15 or 31.

As herein amended, Claims 7, 29, and 37 depend directly from Claim 31. When the recitations of Claims 7, 29, and 37 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 31, it is submitted that Claims 7, 29, and 37 are likewise patentable over Larson and the other art of record.

Also as herein amended, Claims 21, 30, and 36 depend directly from Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 21, 30, and 36 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, it is submitted that Claims 21, 30, and 36 are likewise patentable over Larson and the other art of record.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 2, 7, 15-16, 21, 29-31, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Larson (U.S. 5,365,465) be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 8-10 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Larson in view of Wallschlaeger (U.S. 5,345,381) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 10 and 24, which have been cancelled.

As herein amended, Claims 8-9 are now directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 31, which, as indicated above, is allowable over the art of record. When the recitations of Claims 8-9 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 31, it is submitted that Claims 8-9 are likewise allowable over Larson in view of Wallschlaeger as well as the other art of record.

Also as herein amended, Claims 22-23 are not directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 15, which, as indicated above, is allowable over the art of record. When the recitations of Claims 22-23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, it is submitted that Claims 22-23 are likewise allowable over Larson in view of Wallschlaeger as well as the other art of record.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 8-10 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Larson in view of Wallschlaeger (U.S. 5,345,381) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Alan L. Cassel  
Registration No. 35,842  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070